



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/726,812

12/02/2003

Qiming Zhu

019680-007800US

4116

20350

7590

12/04/2007

TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP  
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER  
EIGHTH FLOOR  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834

EXAMINER

THOMAS, SHANE M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2186

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

12/04/2007

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

**Interview Summary**

Application No.

10/726,812

Applicant(s)

ZHU, QIMING

Examiner

Shane M. Thomas

Art Unit

2186

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Shane M. Thomas.

(3) \_\_\_\_\_.

(2) Dave Raczkowski (Reg. No. 52,145).

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 29 November 2007.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 15.

Identification of prior art discussed: Chatterjee and Moore (both previously made of record).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

  
Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant initiated interview to discuss the grounds of rejection for claims 1 and 15 in light of the present final rejection and the advisory action. Applicant suggested slightly different claim language to claim 1 in order to distinguish Applicant's invention from Chatterjee/Moore. One such suggestion was to state that the disk drives of the present invention were physical disk drives; Chatterjee only taught a controller interfacing with a logical disk. The Examiner acknowledged that such an amendment, taken in the context with the remainder of the claim, would overcome the Chatterjee reference and therefore obviate the §103(a) rejection. Specifically, since Chatterjee only teaches filter device objects connected to logical drives, not physical drives, the prior art made of record is insufficient in teaching the proposed amended claims.

Applicant additionally suggested amending claim 15 to incorporate a limitation that clarifies the functionality/purpose of the RAID controller. The Examiner agreed that the suggested amendment of "wherein the RAID controller is not adapted to interface with any of the plurality of disk of the RAID system," and effectively making the RAID controller a phantom or virtual controller, does not appear to be specifically taught by the combination of Chatterjee and Moore. The Applicant stated that the suggested amendments would be drafted into forthcoming set of claims.